UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,365	09/26/2003	Chris Savarese	06196.P002	3038

7590 04/30/2008

James C. Scheller, Jr.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
D'AGOSTINO, PAUL ANTHONY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,365	SAVARESE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul A. D'Agostino	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *128-141 and 147-149* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *142-146* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *128-141 and 147-149* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This responds to Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and Arguments/Remarks filed 03/17/2008. Claims 128, 132, 136, 139, and 148 have been amended. Claims 1-127 and 142-146 have been cancelled. Claims 128-141 and 147-149 are now pending in this application.

Remarks

1. This acknowledges the support provided by Applicant with respect to the rejection of Claims 128-135, 137, and 147 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Even though the words recess, recessed and below are not expressed in the specification, voids and their relative location are disclosed in Figs. 4A and 4B and paragraphs 59-60, 81, and 86. The rejection of Claims 128-135, 137, and 147 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

2. Examiner acknowledges Applicant's remarks in response to the rejection of Claim 128 for enablement (Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, Page 7). Accordingly, Claim 128 is directed to a golf ball component which does not require incorporating the elements of Claim 130 as suggested in the previous Office Action. This being the case, the rejection for enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

3. This acknowledges Applicant's amendment of Claim 139. The rejection of Claim 139 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.

Claim Interpretation

4. Claims 136-141 and 148-149 contain the words "adjacent to" which are not explicitly defined in the specification or drawings. In Applicant's Arguments/Remarks filed 3/17/2008 (Page 7) Applicant explains adjacent to as meaning "substantially flush." Examiner respectfully disagrees. According to Merriam-Webster's Desk Dictionary (©1995), the first relevant definition applicable of "flush" is: "(7) directly abutting: immediately adjacent and (8) set even with an edge of a type page or column." That having been said, "substantially flush" fails to adequately describe the configuration of the elements in Figs. 4A and 4B. However, Examiner reasonably believes "adjacent to" means "near or close to but not necessarily touching". This meaning appears to best describe what is in Figs. 4A and 4B. Further, whether or not the elastic conductive adhesive is used, it is the proximity of the elements to each other and that conductive contact is made that is critical and not whether a resultant contour, flush or otherwise, is created.

5. Claims 131, 137, and 149 contain "RFID circuitry" which can be active or passive. The invention as disclosed by the specification and drawings does not discuss or teach of the RF devices having an internal power supply necessary for active RFID devices. Thus, the scope of the claims will be limited to passive devices (e.g., diodes, transistors, RFID devices).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 128-129, 136, and 148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that Claims 128-129, 136, and 148 fail to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed 3/17/2008 (Page 7). In that paper, Applicant has stated "Claim 128 is directed to an aspect of Applicant's invention—the core or other spherical object which will become a golf ball…", and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because in Claim 128 "a spherical material" is claimed. Through the specification, the material is defined as a spherical core 46 (e.g., Specification Pages 15, 18, 34), a spherical surface of the core (e.g., Specification Pages 19, 21, 22, 23), and a core or core material (e.g., Specification Pages 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15-27, 33, 34-42). But nowhere is a "spherical material" disclosed nor would it make logical sense. Examiner suggests changing "spherical material" to "core material" where appropriate.

8. Claim 128 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 149 recites the limitation "electronic component." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims which refer only to passive devices. Appropriate correction is required. One suggestion is to amend Claim 128 to read "electrical component."

9. Claim 129 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 129 recites a shell that encloses the spherical material. However, Applicant discloses the shell as

part of a golf ball and not of the golf ball component (Fig. 3C). For example, in [0007](Specification Page 3) Applicant states "In one exemplary embodiment of an aspect of the invention, a golf ball includes a shell, a core material which is encased within the shell, and a tag having a diode which is coupled to an antenna which has at least a portion formed from an elastic conductive material which is encased within an outer surface of the shell." Also, in [0009](Specification Page 3) "In another exemplary embodiment, a golf ball includes a shell, a core material which is encased within the shell, wherein the core material has a void on an outer surface of the core material, and a tag having a diode which is coupled to an antenna, wherein the diode has at least a portion thereof disposed in the void." Examiner recommends cancelling Claim 129 and amending "shell" in Claim 133 since it is not disclosed or taught to be a part of the golf ball component.

10. Claim 132 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 132 recites the limitation "said tag." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Appropriate correction is required. One suggestion is to amend Claim 130 to read "wherein a first semiconductor, which is coupled to a first antenna to form a first tag, is disposed …". Then consistently amend Claim 132 to recite a "first tag".

11. Claims 132 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claims 132 and 139 recite a golf ball durability and weight. There is insufficient antecedent basis for "said golf ball" (mentioned twice in the claim). Further, a golf ball is

not disclosed or taught to be part of a golf ball component as recited in the claim preamble. Examiner recommends truncation of the claim after "separating said handheld transmitting/receiving device and said tag." (Claims Page 3 Line 1).

12. Claims 138 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 138 and 139 (mentioned in two places) recite a “tag.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for just “tag.” Examiner recommends amending the claim to recite a “first tag.” This makes the claim more consistent with the “second tag” recited in Claim 141.

13. Claims 131, 137, and 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claims 131, 137, and 149 contain “at least one of a RFID circuitry, an integrated circuit and a diode”. The scope of the claim is limited to what is taught in the specification. For example, in Para [0069](Specification Page 25and Fig. 2A), a tag is defined as comprising a diode or “Alternatively, a transistor or other types of components (e.g., an RFID integrated circuit) may be utilized.” Form the claim language it is unknown whether at least two elements and a diode are claimed or as if at least one of three elements is claimed. Examiner recommends changing "at least one of a RFID circuitry, an integrated circuit and a diode" to -- at least one of a Radio Frequency Identification Device (RFID), a transistor, or a diode --. Appropriate correction is required.

14. Claims 131 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Applicant teaches that at least one RFID device may be utilized ([0069], Specification

Page 25) and that "The RFID device is designed to be used only at short range (e.g., less than about 10 feet) ([0004], Specification Page 2) yet Applicant claims performance wherein "The golf ball is durably detectable …over a range of at least about 20 feet ([0008], Specification Page 3). Therefore, Claim 132 and 139 depend from claims which read on RF devices yet fail to properly claim the performance of what Applicant teaches of his invention. Appropriate correction is required.

15. Claim 149 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 149 recites the limitation "said first electric component." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Appropriate correction is required. One suggestion is to amend Claim 149 to read "said first semiconductor." Appropriate correction to all 35 U.S.C. § 112 sections is required.

16. Claims 129-135, 137-141, 147 and 149 are rejected for being dependent on the rejected base claim and incorporating the above issues by their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

18. Claims 128-130, 136, and 148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,113,504 to Kuesters (Kuesters).

In Reference to Claims 128, 135-136, and 148

Kuesters discloses a golf ball component (Fig. 2A), comprising:

a spherical material ("outer member" 16 "made of shock absorbing synthetic material" (Col. 3 Lines 47-67)) having an outer spherical surface and having a first void recessed below the outer spherical surface (Fig. 2A recess for "diode" 12 located at 12 o'clock position) and a second void recessed below the outer spherical surface of said spherical material (Fig. 2A recess for "diode" located at 6 o'clock position), the first void being located at a first pole of a first axis of the spherical material and the second void being located at a second pole of the first axis (Fig. 2A wherein both recesses are along axis Z), wherein the first void and the second void are configured to receive at least one electronic component (Fig. 2A "diodes" 12); and

{a first semiconductor (electrical component) (Fig. 2A "diode"), and wherein the first semiconductor {electrical component} has a first surface disposed adjacent to the base of the first void (portion disposed within said first void} and coupled to the base by the adhesive material {adhesive material between the spherical material at a base of said first void and said first electrical component}, and wherein the first semiconductor {electrical component} has a second surface which is parallel with the first surface, and wherein the second surface is adjacent to the outer surface of the spherical material at an upper end of the void which is adjacent to the outer surface (Fig. 2A Kuesters discloses a resin for location 20 "thereby keeping them from moving of vibrating" however, Kuesters incorporates the content of U.S. Patent No. 5,564,698 to Honey (Honey) whereby Honey in a similar configuration of voids and diodes (Honey Fig. 2) for

a hockey puck teaches "The preferred embodiment includes twelve infrared emitting diodes along outer circumference 16, spaced apart at 30 degree intervals. By the phrase 'along an outer circumference' it is meant that the diodes are generally spaced at or near the outer circumference. For example, the diodes can be recessed (e.g. 1/16") from the circumference and still be 'along the outer circumference.' If the diodes are recessed from the circumference, then there may be an indent in the surface of the puck in front of the diode. As an option, the indent could be filled with an IR transparent epoxy or other filling material which would not change the elasticity or color of the puck." Col. 4 Lines 42-63)}.

In Reference to Claim 129

Kuesters discloses a shell ("golf ball 10 can also be enveloped with a thin protective cover (not shown) transparent to infrared radiation.") (Col. 3 Lines 65-67).

In Reference to Claims 130, 138, and 147

Kuesters discloses a golf ball component (Fig. 2A) wherein a first semiconductor {electrical component} (Fig. 2A "diode" 12) is disposed at least partially in the first void (Fig. 2A "diode" 12 in recess located at 12 o'clock position), and a second semiconductor {electrical component} (Fig. 2A "diode" 12) is disposed at least partially in the second void (Fig. 2A "diode" 12 in recess located at 6 o'clock position) and wherein each semiconductor is coupled to a first and second antenna and the first antenna is substantially orthogonal to the second antenna {patterned as radial

transmission lines} (Kuesters discloses a second embodiment of the invention using a conventional radio frequency circuit with an antenna and incorporates U.S. Patent No. 5,432,549 to Englmeier or a combination of antennas (Col. 8 Lines 54-67); further Englmeier discloses a multiple antenna diversity system Col. 3 Lines 17-25). Kuesters inherently discloses orthogonal antennas as each antenna is coupled to diodes in recesses located along a Z axis as in Fig. 2A.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

21. Claims 131, 137, and 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,113,504 to Kuesters (Kuesters) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,059,974 to Golliffe et al. (Golliffe).

Kuesters discloses a system substantially equivalent to Applicant's claimed invention. Kuesters also discloses wherein the outer surface is a spherical surface and the first void is recessed below the outer surface (See rejection of Claim 128). However, Kuesters discloses a first and second diode (Fig. 2A) but is silent on a system wherein a first semiconductor includes at least one of a RFID circuitry and an integrated circuit with said diode and wherein a second semiconductor includes at least one of a RFID circuitry and an integrated circuit with said diode.

Gilliffe teaches of a passive identification device (preferably a radio frequency identification device Col. 1 Lines 33-34 and an ASIC chip 12 as in Fig. 1 and Col. 2 Lines 10-22; also, "The device operates at radio frequency preferably in the range …It also comprises a generally circular copper coil aerial 14 and arranged to receive interrogation signals from external readers and to transmit an appropriate response." (Col. 2 Lines 10-22). Gilliffe's provides this system of coded golf balls in order to efficiently run golf driving ranges (Col. 1 Lines 14-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the passive identification system as taught by Gilliffe into the teachings of Kuesters in order to efficiently run golf driving ranges.

22. Claims 132 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,113,504 to Kuesters (Kuesters) in view of U.S. Patent No.

7,059,974 to Golliffe et al. (Golliffe) and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0058749 to Pirritano et al. (Pirritano).

Kuesters as modified by Gilliffe discloses a system substantially equivalent to Applicant's claimed invention. However, Kuesters as modified by Gilliffe fails to disclose wherein said tag is detectable with a handheld transmitting receiving device over a range of at least 20 feet separating said handheld transmitting/receiving device and said tag.

Pirritano teaches of a light weight and portable remote sensing golf ball location system ([0011] and Fig. 1) wherein said tag ((“a radio frequency (“RF”) transmitter/receiver capable of energizing the passive array and of a detecting a signal emitted by the array [0012]) is detectable with a handheld transmitting/receiving device (0011]) over a range of at least 20 feet separating said handheld transmitting/receiving device and said tag (“Further, the signal emitted by the passive array is omni-directional and therefore detectable by the transmitter/receiver regardless of the orientation of the golf ball on the course. Also, the present invention can detect a golf ball incorporating the passive array regardless of whether the ball is obscured by foliage. In addition, the RF transmitter/receiver of the present invention possesses sufficient transmitter power to provide an effective range of at least 100 feet, yet power consumption is sufficiently low such that the transponder/receiver can be operated with ordinary dry cell batteries. Other features and advantages of the invention will become apparent from the following detailed description.” [0014]). Pirritano provides this system in order to provide a

system for locating golf balls ([0012]) of sufficiently low power consumption to be lightweight and portable and preferably hand-held [0011].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the system as taught by Pirritano into the teachings of Kuesters as modified by Golliffe in order to provide a system for locating golf balls of sufficiently low power consumption to be lightweight and portable and preferably hand-held.

Kuesters as modified by Gilliffe and Pirritano discloses the claimed invention except for wherein said golf ball has sufficient durability to survive at least 20 standard cannon test hits and the golf ball weighs less than 45.927 grams. Kuesters does incorporate the content of U.S. Patent No. 5,564,698 to Honey et al (Honey) wherein an electromagnetic device is modified to fit in a golf ball with a weight not more than 45.93 gm and a diameter not less than 42.67 mm, as required by the rules of golf (Col. 4 Lines 1-9) in order to play the game of golf and to locate the ball. The golf ball must be of sufficient durability to be used for this intended purpose.

It would have been obvious matter of deign choice to provide a golf ball of 45.927 grams (since it is below the standard) and of a durability sufficient to play the game of golf as the one in Kruesters, since Applicant has not disclosed that the weight or durability solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the weight and durability of the golf ball of Kruesters.

23. Claim 133 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,113,504 to Kuesters (Kuesters) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,059,974 to Golliffe et al. (Golliffe) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,782,730 to Horchler (Horchler).

Kuesters as modified by Golliffe discloses a system substantially equivalent to Applicant's claimed invention. However, Kuesters as modified by Golliffe is silent as to the location of an antenna wherein the first antenna has at least a portion disposed between an outer spherical surface and an inner curved surface of said shell (Figs. 1 and 2 wherein “transmitting coil” L is located outside of the outer spherical surface of set resin sphere 5 and under central resilient sphere 3), and wherein the antenna is designed to receive a radiofrequency (RF) signal of a first frequency and to re-radiate a return RF signal of a second frequency (“Conveniently the oscillator is tuned to a particular frequency and generates an induction field at that frequency, the oscillatory circuit squegging so that its output comprises bursts of oscillation at the desired frequency interspersed by longer periods of non-oscillation (Col. 1 Lines 28-34) in order to “reduce the occurrence of lost golf balls and wherein players employing golf balls which can be recovered are at an advantage both financially and by not losing unnecessary points over lost balls” (Col. 1 Lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the coil and tuning frequencies as taught by Horchler into the teachings of Kuesters as modified by Golliffe to reduce the occurrence of lost golf

balls and wherein players employing golf balls which can be recovered are at an advantage both financially and by not losing unnecessary points over lost balls.

24. Claims 134 and 140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,113,504 to Kuesters (Kuesters) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,059,974 to Golliffe et al. (Golliffe) and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0017884 to Masters et al. (Masters).

Kuesters as modified by Golliffe discloses a system substantially equivalent to Applicant's claimed invention. However, Kuesters as modified by Golliffe is silent on an antenna made of an elastic conductive material.

Masters teaches of a conductive elastic material used in golf equipment and can serve a material for antennas ("The full stress recovery of a superelastic material can occur with up to approximately 8% elongation in Nitinol (NiTi). Because of this large elastic range, superelastic materials are used in applications such as cardiovascular stents, mobile telephone antennas, and eyeglass frames. Superelastic materials have not previously been used in sporting equipment such as golf clubs or hockey sticks." [0008] in order to provide superelastic alloys [0010] for use in golf wherein the elements of the club can recover to their original pre-stressed stage after a dynamically applied stress is released (i.e. after the club head strikes the ball" [0022].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the superelastic alloys for making an antenna as taught by Masters into the teachings of Kuesters as modified by Golliffe in order to provide golf balls that can recover to their original pre-stressed stage after a dynamically applied

stress is released.

25. Claim 141. (See the rejections of Claims 136 and 138-140).

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 128-141 and 147-149 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is provided in the Notice of References Cited.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. D'Agostino whose telephone number is (571)270-1992. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

29. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John M. Hotaling, II can be reached on (571) 272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

30. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Paul A. D'Agostino/
Examiner, Art Unit 3714
.